Pam. Int. Rel.
Nat. Study Conf.

The Churches and World Peace

A Syllabus of Topics, Problems, and Suggestions for Study Groups

The Continuation Committee
of the
National Study Conference on the Churches and World Peace

Reverend Sidney L. Gulick, *Secretary*
105 East 22nd Street
New York, N. Y.

25 Cents each
Ten for $1.

FOREWORD

"The National Study Conference on the Churches and World Peace" was held in Washington, D. C., December 1-3, 1925. In preparation for the Conference three Commissions submitted in advance comprehensive and searching questions calculated to promote thought and to stimulate discussion of the three purposes of the Conference:

To Study: The Christian Ideals and Attitude
What the Churches Ought to Do

To Plan: A Nation-wide Campaign of Education Through the Churches.

The Conference

The Conference consisted of 160 officially designated delegates from the following communions and religious bodies:

Northern Baptist Convention
Southern Baptist Convention
Church of the Brethren
Christian Church
Churches of God in N. A.
Congregational Churches
Disciples of Christ
Friends (4 bodies)
Greek Orthodox Church
Mennonites (2 bodies)
Methodist Episcopal Church
Methodist Episcopal Church, South
Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.
Presbyterian Church in the U. S.
Reformed Presbyterian Church
Protestant Episcopal Church
Reformed Church in America
Reformed Church in the U. S.
Salvation Army
Seventh Day Baptist Churches
United Brethren Church
United Presbyterian Church
American Unitarian Association
Universalist Church

The Message to the Churches

Three full days of intensive discussion resulted in (1) the "Message to the Churches" and (2) the formation of the "Continuation Committee", to carry out the educational program recommended in the Message. The publication of the Message, the conveying of this Message to all the Churches of the United States for their appropriate actions, the inauguration of the educational procedure recommended and the issuing of this Syllabus are the first steps of the Continuation Committee in carrying out the instructions of the Conference.

The Purpose of this Syllabus

The purpose of this Syllabus is to suggest in a general and unbiased way, with a view to promoting intelligent discussion and to securing effective action, the vast range of considerations which men of goodwill need to study. The problems must be clearly understood and the stupendous task and urgent duty of abolishing war need to be determinedly undertaken.

It is not expected that any group will be able to deal with all the questions here raised. The group might well choose for itself six or eight major topics, —one for each discussion period. It would probably be better to discuss a few topics carefully than to attempt to cover too many at the cost of superficial consideration. The group might well agree not to read the Message until its own discussions have been practically completed and its own "findings" drafted. Comparison with the Message may then be helpful.

The Conduct of Discussion Groups

In making use of this Syllabus the adoption of the right procedure is highly important. The following suggestions may be helpful:

1. The Chairman should secure and carefully study "The Why and How of Group Discussion" (H. S. Elliott; Association Press, 347 Madison Avenue, N. Y.; $ .25). Here is described the distinctive technique of the discussion method and of "group thinking".

2. The success of the discussion group depends quite as much on the cooperative spirit of the group as on the leadership of the Chairman. "In group discussion, each comes ready not only to contribute his best thought and experience on the question involved, but also to hear and understand in turn the viewpoint of others." Such a procedure will promote "group thinking".

3. The topic for discussion should be a "live question" on which there are divergent views.

4. The purpose of the discussion should be:

(1) To see how far divergencies of view are due to a differing use of words, to insufficient knowledge of facts, and to differing emphasis on principles

(2) To find, if possible, a larger view comprising the truth in all the varying viewpoints.

5. Constant effort should be made by the Chairman and also by the group to avoid mere random talk, to exclude trivialities or irrelevancies, and to prevent mere matching of wits by clever talkers. To this end the discussion topic should be clearly defined, the discussion should proceed from point to point in logical order, and an effort should be made to frame the result in "findings" or statements combining what all agree is the larger and more adequate viewpoint. In this process the use of a blackboard will help much.

6. It may happen that one form of statement may not satisfy all. Two or three statements may be needed, more or less in contrast or even in conflict, in order to express the mind of the minority as well as that of the majority.

7. In carrying on the discussion and in framing the "findings", the legalistic or parliamentary procedure of resolutions, amendments, tablings, previous questions, etc., is to be avoided. This procedure is confusing and distracts attention from the real issue. There is a distinct technique for discussion groups (cf. 1 above) which the Chairman and, if possible, one or two leaders should seek to master in advance.

8. Remember that a discussion group is not a debating society in which one side seeks to gain a victory over the other, but a group in which all are seeking together to find the truth, to think out a problem of thought or of conduct.

Suggested Discussion Topics

Discussion I.

What were the teaching and the spirit of Jesus with regard to peace and war? Was Jesus a patriot? Was Jesus a pacifist? Can a pacifist be a patriot? Or a patriot a pacifist?

Discussion II.

Do or do not the Churches of the United States have a duty and a responsibility in the program to abolish war? In either case, why? If the Churches deal in any way with the problems of peace and war, are they or are they not invading the function of the State?

Discussion III.

Is it ever morally right to use physical force in the maintenance of right and of justice? For an individual? A city? A nation? A combination of nations? Are the use of violence and slaughter in war the same in principle as their use by police? Define the differences between the principles and procedures of a police force and those of an army.

Discussion IV.

What programs for creating goodwill between nations might and should the Churches of the United States adopt in their program for the abolition of war? Consider how far they are practicable.

Discussion V.

Should or should not the United States promise to submit every threatening dispute, whatever its nature, to some international tribunal for peaceful settlement? Should or should not the United States unite with other nations in declaring aggressive war a crime and in accepting obligations to help restrain or punish an aggressor nation? Should the United States help establish a world police system?

Discussion VI.

Should or should not the United States become a member of the League of Nations? If with reservations and conditions, what should they be?

Discussion VII.

Is or is not a warless world necessarily stupid, cowardly, unheroic? What programs, activities and objectives can be held out to young people calling for courage, devotion, self sacrifice,—a "moral equivalent for war"?

Discussion VIII.

What is your church,—local, community, national,—actually doing to help abolish war? Is it doing its full duty? What more can and should it do?

INTRODUCTION

THE PRIOR QUESTION

There are those who believe that the Churches as Churches have nothing to do in the matter of abolishing war, while other Christians hold that Churches as such have inescapable duties and responsibilities in the program.

Seven Differing Conceptions

1. The Church is the divine institution for proclaiming the love of God to sinful men. Its exclusive duty is in the realm of religion—the reconciliation of man to God. It is not its function to deal with matters of war and peace. Moreover, accepting the Old Testament Scriptures as a part of the Word of God, it cannot declare war a crime and seek to abolish it, inasmuch as, according to these Scriptures, wars have been waged by the direct command of God as one way of disciplining unfaithful nations.

2. The Church, being purely religious, has as a Church nothing whatever to teach or to do about war. In its teaching function it should indeed inculcate the universal principles, ideals and spirit of Jesus, but it should do this without any specific application or reference to their bearing on concrete social, political or international relations. In proportion as men generally become Christian, the whole social and international order will improve and war will naturally disappear.

3. The Church should teach definitely that war is wrong because contrary to the spirit and teachings of Jesus, but it should not adopt or teach any concrete proposals or advocate any definite political policies or plans looking to the abolition of war, because such plans and policies would inevitably go beyond the realm of religion and enter into that of politics.

4. The Church, as the Prophet of God to Nations and Governments, as well as to individuals, should unfold those principles of the Gospel which enjoin national submission to Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace and the Reigning King, as the primary condition of peace and prosperity. It should not only frankly declare that war is the great negation of Christianity and the great moral issue before the world, but also seek to educate its membership and the public in regard to constructive plans and policies. It should not, however, seek to mass its members in a political campaign in support of any given plans or proposals.

5. The Church as the teacher of men and nations, the divinely established organism for bringing in the Kingdom of God on Earth, should not only instruct the people in the principles of the Kingdom and inspire them with its ideals and spirit, but mass them in campaigns for constructive policies and measures for permanent world peace. Yet it should not go so far as to refuse, in time of war, to support the Government or have anything to do with the war.

6. The Church should boldly announce its condemnation of war and the war system; it should, nevertheless, recognize that each individual is free to follow the judgment of his own conscience without loss of church membership or good standing, whatever that judgment may be. It should declare that it will never, as a Church, approve or support another war nor assist in recruiting soldiers from its membership. It should insist that every program for the abolition of war, though political in one aspect, is in another profoundly moral and therefore the concern of the Church; and it should, as a consequence, throw its entire power as a church into training and guiding citizens intelligently and unitedly to seek the adoption by the nation of those constructive policies and programs by which it is believed war may be abolished. Thus and thus alone, it is contended, can the Church assert its appropriate moral leadership of the nations in the overthrow of their greatest common foe.

7. The Church as such should "excommunicate" war and should teach that henceforth all war of every kind and for any purpose is always and absolutely wrong and contrary to God's will; that it is sin, not only for the nations that resort to it (on whichever side right and justice may lie) but also for the individuals that participate in it.

Questions

1. Do these seven attitudes adequately and accurately state the various positions taken? Are there other attitudes?

2. How do those who take the first three positions defend themselves against the charge that they fail to understand Christ's teaching regarding the Kingdom of God on Earth, for which Christians are to work and pray?

3. How do those who take the other positions defend themselves from the charge that they are confusing religion and politics, the functions of the Church with those of the State?

4. Try to frame a brief statement regarding the duty of the Church—the local church, the national Church and the Church Universal—in the program to abolish war by creating and maintaining the spirit, the institutions and the procedures of peace.

Note

The remainder of this Syllabus is based on the assumption that the Churches as Churches do have responsibilities and duties in regard to the establishment of peace and the abolition of war.

CHAPTER I

THE CHRISTIAN IDEALS AND ATTITUDE

I. The Spirit and the Teaching of Jesus

A genuine Christian, in struggling with any problem, seeks to learn what Jesus taught and did in regard to it. If it is clear that He did not deal with the specific problem in question, the Christian then asks what Jesus' teaching would probably have been, judging from His spirit and the general principles that underlie His Gospel and His entire life. What then was the teaching of Jesus with regard to peace and war, direct or implicit?

1. In the Sermon on the Mount was Jesus thinking of the relations of nations? If not, what bearing, if any, does the Sermon have on the problems of peace and war?

2. In Matthew 5:44 (Love your Enemies) and 5:39 (Resist not him that is evil) is Jesus teaching the doctrine of absolute non-resistance? If not, how should the teaching of these passages be paraphrased in order to bring out clearly just what he meant?

3. Does the record of Christ's driving the money changers out of the temple (Matthew 21:12-13) modify our understanding of His teaching regarding the use of force?

4. Do the burning words of Jesus in denouncing the Scribes and Pharisees (Matthew 23:13-33) throw any light on the right attitude of modern Christians toward instigators of national and racial passions and conflicts?

5. Just what did Jesus mean when He told His disciples that if any one did not have a sword he should buy one (Luke 22:36), even if it might be necessary to sell his cloak for the purpose? Is this passage correctly used in proving that Jesus justifies war? If not, why?

6. In His declaration (Matthew 10:34) that He came "not to send peace, but a sword" was Jesus thinking of war? Just what was He teaching? Are interpreters justified in using this passage to prove that Jesus was not a "pacifist"?

7. In declaring that "all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" was Jesus intending to teach His disciples a universal lesson in regard to war? If not, what was He seeking to inculcate?

8. Did Jesus ever face, directly or indirectly, the question of a national uprising of His people against the rule of Rome? What passages in the Gospel throw light on this question? On what grounds did He oppose such an uprising?

9. Did Jesus' reply to Pilate ("If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." John 18:36) teach or imply that His disciples should never fight for any cause?

10. When Jesus taught His disciples to pray that the Kingdom of God might come on earth as it was in heaven (Matthew 6:10) and that only they who do the will of the Father shall enter into His Kingdom, did He include in His thought the duty of Christians to work for world peace and for the abolition of war? If not, do these teachings bear in any way on the problem of our study? If so, in what way?

11. Do some of the specific teachings and acts of Jesus appear to be at variance with His underlying spirit and purpose? If so, how may they be reconciled? If not reconcilable, which should prevail?

12. What is to be said of the contention that, in carrying out the spirit of love and service, it may sometimes be necessary to resort even to war?

13. Is it possible to summarize briefly just what the teachings and underlying principles of Jesus were as they bear on the modern problem facing His disciples in regard to peace and war?

II. Some Special Problems

In order to help clarify the situation and to make the problems stand out distinctly in all their difficulty and importance, five groups of questions may well receive special attention.

A. The Use of Military Force

Questions are raised today regarding the moral right to the use of physical force, even in self-defense against aggression. A few questions will suggest the points at issue.

1. What has been the historic attitude of the Church in regard to war? Before Constantine? Since? How shall we explain the change? Is it justifiable on Christian principles?

2. Does the teaching of the Old Testament in regard to war afford a rational and moral basis for modern war?

3. Is an individual entitled, under the moral law and on Christian principles, to defend his life or the honor and life of his family against a robber

or murderer? Should he resist the aggressor even to the extent, if necessary, of killing him?

4. What bearing on this question has Jesus' teaching (Matthew 5:39) regarding non-resistance?

5. Is a nation entitled, under the universal moral law, to resist aggressor individuals and nations, even to the extent of destroying their property and taking their lives? If so, why? If not, why?

6. In defense of the helpless and in the maintenance of justice is a Christian individual or nation entitled to use force, even to the taking of life when necessary, in restraining a brutal bully or a "mad dog nation" from carrying out murderous purposes? In either case, why?

7. Is a nation that really needs more territory for its people or more economic resources for its industrial enterprises entitled to secure them at the cost of coercion and even, if necessary, of war? In other words, is a nation ever justified in aggression against another nation? Why?

8. Is the use of an international police force equivalent to war? Give reasons for and against.

B. The Individual and the State

The mutual relations, rights and duties of the individual and the State have from ancient times proved to be perplexing questions for all thinkers.

1. Is the authority of the State over an individual member absolute and unlimited? If it is limited, by what authority or principles?

2. Has the individual certain essential rights as over against the State? If so, what are they? How may they be discovered and enforced?

3. Is or is not the individual as a soldier under orders morally right in doing in time of war what it would be morally wrong for him to do under ordinary conditions? Why?

4. Has the State the moral right to conscript the individual and compel him to participate in war in violation of the dictates of his conscience? If so, on what grounds?

5. Can a Christian who believes that personal participation in war is absolutely forbidden by the principles and teachings of Jesus, rightly participate in "works of mercy and relief" by which the war is made less intolerable and also possibly prolonged? Give reasons for and against.

6. Can a Christian who is a thorough-going "pacifist" pay taxes and otherwise support a Government that is making vast war preparations? In either case, why?

C. The Church and the State

The question of the respective spheres of activity and authority of Church and State has long perplexed thoughtful men.

1. Is the distinction between the Church and the State, as dealing respectively with matters religious and secular, adequate? If not, why?

2. Are there matters in which the State has the unquestioned right to control or limit the teachings and activities of the Church? Specify.

3. Are there matters in which the Church has the unquestioned right to control or limit the policies and activities of the State?

4. When Jesus stated that the Jews should "Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's" (Matthew 22:21), was He thinking of the relations of State and Church or of a foreign ruler and religion? If the latter, does this text throw any light on the true relations of Church and State? If so, what?

5. Is the State to be regarded by Christians as a human invention and institution without divine sanctions or authority, and the Church as a divine institution with superhuman authority as it faces both the individual and the State? If so, on what grounds? If not, on what grounds?

6. If the mutual rights and authority of Church and State, of religion and government, are not clear, how should the Churches proceed to clarify the situation?

D. National Sovereignty and International Relations

In thinking on the nature of the State, some extremists have declared that it is a "natural" entity of power, possessed of absolute sovereignty and unlimited authority, not only over its own members but in its dealings with other nations. It is the might of the State that creates its right; briefly, "might makes right". Its aggressions against neighbor States are right if it has the power to carry them out. A weak State has no inherent rights against a powerful State. It is the natural right of strong States to swallow up weak States just as it is the natural right of big fish to eat up little fish. A State is limited in what it may do only by its might. This idea of absolute and unlimited national sovereignty has been held by not a few thinkers in many lands.

1. Are there Americans who hold this view of absolute national sovereignty?

2. In the judgment of the Churches, is a nation an absolutely free, unlimited, sovereign entity, at

liberty to do what it will and can to other nations? If not, by what principles is its sovereignty limited? What should the Churches teach?

3. Is a nation merely a being of "power" and therefore under no moral obligations? If it is under moral obligations, what are they?

4. Is a nation competent to be sole judge of its acts, rights and duties in relation to other nations? If not, who are competent?

5. Do the foregoing questions and considerations throw any light on the duties of States and Governments to cooperate in finding and maintaining international right and justice, in removing the causes of war and in establishing the institutions and procedures essential for world peace?

E. Participation or Non-Participation in War

We now take up the personal question regarding the duty of a Christian in case his country becomes involved in war;—should he or should he not participate? If he should, on what grounds? If he should not, on what grounds?

It is assumed in this section that the person whose duty is being studied is a real Christian and also a loyal patriot. It is also assumed (although at present it is far from being the case) that long before the outbreak of war the Christian patriot has made vigorous and continuous effort on behalf of peace; that his church and denomination have taken more or less vigorous part in the program to outlaw and banish war. He has urged the adoption by his country of those international principles, policies and procedures which he believed would prevent war. War has nevertheless come. What, then, is his duty as a citizen and as a Christian? Under these conditions, has the Church as such a duty to perform?

(A) The First Alternative—Participation

The Christian patriot may decide that, though war is the most terrible calamity that can come to his country, and though as a Christian and a patriot he hates war with absolute hatred, with a hatred not less than that of a thoroughgoing "pacifist", nevertheless it is his duty, both as a Christian and as a patriot, to stand by his country and to help it if possible to win the victory. The reasons given for this decision may differ greatly with different individuals, but they may perhaps be summarized in the following paragraphs:

1. Because this is a war in self-defense. It was the enemy that threw down the challenge, made the attack, committed the unforgivable crime, and there was no course left in honor but to accept the challenge and punish the foe.

2. Because the Government honestly and sincerely made every effort to avert war. It offered many extraordinary concessions. It even offered to submit the dispute to arbitration. The enemy, however, believing it could win by war, refused to listen to any plan that might avert it and wantonly attacked us.

3. Because the real interests of the entire world—moral, political and economic,—will be best conserved if we win and the enemy is defeated. Our victory will help to end the war-system and establish honor, justice and righteousness, while victory by the enemy would but perpetuate the reign of violence and wrong.

4. Because the mutual relations of the individual and his people constitute such a unique solidarity that it is impossible for either to exist without the other. The nation is an organic unity. It is not made up of the mere aggregation of its citizens, as a heap of sand is made up of the aggregation of its sand particles. It is rather a living organism, an essential unity, in which all live in and by and for all. The very existence and even the nature of the individual are due to the existence and nature of his people. There are, therefore, mutual obligations which neither is at liberty to repudiate. If repudiated in words and in attempted acts, the relations and obligations still remain.

5. Because when war comes the very existence of the nation is the issue, and when this issue arises every other issue disappears. Liberties and privileges which the individual enjoyed as a matter of right in times of peace, disappear in times of war. Questions of right and wrong in the transactions and relations that preceded the outbreak of war are now irrelevant. Freedom of speech, assembly and travel are no longer possible. The entire energy of the nation must be given to the one supreme effort to maintain self existence. No individual citizen, therefore, has the right to choose whether or not he will support his nation. Refusal is equivalent to taking sides with the enemy. Refusal is treason and deserves only one result—death.

6. Because every principle of loyalty to Christ and to country requires the Christian and the patriot to serve to the uttermost and to give even life if need be for those whom he loves.

7. Because the issues involved in the war, and the circumstances under which it took place, are such that the fundamental principles and ideals of Jesus are imperiled and can be maintained only by war. Loyalty to Christ, therefore, impels the Christian to support his country in the war; he has no other option.

Questions

1. What other reasons may be given by a Christian patriot for participating in a war in which his country is involved?

2. Do any of the reasons given above for personal participation appeal to you as not valid? Why? Would you state in some other form your reasons for participation? Are some of the reasons valid? Which? Why?

3. In advance of the occurrence of war, has a Christian patriot the moral right to sign a solemn pledge that under no circumstances whatever will he ever participate in any war? If not, why?

4. Is or is not a Christian patriot entitled to determine his attitude toward a war in which his country is already engaged by consideration of the circumstances that produced it? In either case, why?

5. When war takes place, are all questions of right and wrong regarding the causes of the war irrelevant? Do all rights of an individual disappear in time of war? If not, what rights remain?

6. Is it right or wise for a church, local or national, to take action as a church for or against participation? In either case, why?

7. Is the question of responsibility for war (war-guilt) irrelevant to the Christian patriot? If so, why? If not, why?

(B) The Second Alternative—Non-Participation

The Christian patriot may decide that although he has made every possible effort to persuade his country to adopt those courses of action which would have averted the coming of war, now that war has nevertheless come, it is his Christian and also his patriotic duty to refuse to participate in it in any way whatever. The reasons given may be one or more of the following affirmations.

1. Because the Government in resorting to war is clearly in the wrong.

(1) It has followed for many years a policy of selfish disregard of the interests of other lands

(2) It has steadily filled its neighbors with suspicion of its motives and fear of its purposes because of its ever enlarging program of military preparedness

(3) It has refused to cooperate with other nations in general plans and measures for the peaceful settlement of all disputes and the outlawing of every war

(4) It has refused to submit the particular dispute involved in this war to some competent impartial tribunal, on the false assumption that a nation is competent to be its own plaintiff, sheriff, witnesses, jury, judge and executioner in a matter involving its interests

(5) It is in fact the aggressor.

2. Because the Government should have followed the spirit of Jesus and the methods of peace to the end. It did, indeed, reduce its military and naval preparations to some degree. It did cooperate with the nations in establishing a World Court of Justice and other tribunals and procedures for settling every dispute by methods of law, arbitration and conciliation. It did, in general, adopt conciliatory policies and it did offer to submit the dispute in question to the World Court of Justice or to arbitration. But when the enemy, accepting none of our efforts for a peaceful settlement, wantonly attacked us, even then the Government should not have opposed force to force. It should have displayed the spirit of Jesus to the end, and in the end its moral triumph would have brought the beginning of a war-free world.

3. Because it is impossible to know the full truth regarding the cause of the war. All modern governments and big business interests conceal important facts, release "inspired" but misleading alleged news, and make it impossible for the private citizen to know the justice or the guilt in any given war. War makers in each land represent their own country as the victim of wrong and appeal to the nation's pride and patriotism to fight for the alleged cause of justice, liberty and national honor.

4. Because the only way by which finally to bring the nation and the world to abandon war is for multitudes of individuals in many lands to refuse to participate, even at the cost, if necessary, of sacrificing their lives in the cause.

5. Because non-participation is in reality the highest form of patriotism—for the non-participator is seeking for his country a spirit and a method in dealing with international relations, problems and disputes that are essentially right and in the end far more profitable even economically than the method and the spirit of war.

6. Because war is intrinsically, absolutely and always wrong. War violates every Christian ideal and principle. It disregards the plain teachings as well as the spirit of Jesus. A Christian who participates in war personally repudiates his Master and his Master's teaching regarding

(1) Universal human brotherhood

(2) The responsibilities of universal love, compassion and mercy

(3) The obligations of sincerity and truthfulness

(4) The privileges of unselfish service

(5) The intrinsic value of human life

(6) The sacredness of personality.

War is, therefore, the supreme collective sin of humanity. The individual Christian should have no part in it. The only possible Christian attitude toward war is absolute hatred of it, opposition to it, and refusal to support it or participate in it in any way whatever.

Questions

1. What other reasons are actually given by those who advocate non-participation?

2. Of the reasons given above for non-participation, which appeal to you as valid? Which appear to you to be fallacious? Why?

3. Can a man be morally right in refusing to support his country in a war in which he judges the enemy to be clearly the aggressor and his own Government in the right? If so, why? If not, why?

4. Does the phrase "My country, may she ever be right, but right or wrong, my country" express the true spirit of patriotism? If so, why? If not, why?

5. Does an individual citizen have the right, after declaration of war, to reject the judgment of his government? If not, why? If so, why?

6. In dealing with these questions would it help to lay down definitions of patriotism and loyalty? If so, how should they be defined?

Suggestive Literature

THE BIBLE AND UNIVERSAL PEACE, G. H. Gilbert; 1914; Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York.

WHAT DID JESUS REALLY TEACH ABOUT WAR?, Edward Leigh Pell; 1917; Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.

CHRIST AND WAR, William E. Wilson; 1913; James Clarke and Company, London.

CHRIST AND THE WORLD AT WAR, Sermons by Twelve British Church Leaders; 1917; The Pilgrim Press, Boston, Mass.

CHRIST OR NAPOLEON—WHICH?, Peter Ainslie; 1915; Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.

WAR INCONSISTENT WITH THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST, David Low Dodge; 1905; Ginn and Company, Boston, Mass.

CHRIST OR MARS?, Will Irwin; 1923; D. Appleton and Company, New York.

IS CHRISTIANITY PRACTICABLE?, William Adams Brown; 1916; Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE STATE, S. Parkes Cadman; 1924; The Macmillan Company, New York.

WHAT THE WAR IS TEACHING, Charles E. Jefferson; 1916; Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.

WHY NOT TRY CHRISTIANITY?, Samuel Zane Batten; 1923; George H. Doran Company, New York.

WHY CHRISTIANITY DID NOT PREVENT WAR, Isaac J. Lansing; 1918; George H. Doran Company, New York.

WAR AND THE SOUL, R. J. Campbell; 1916; Dodd, Mead and Company, New York.

THE CHURCH IN TIME OF WAR, A. F. Winnington Ingram; 1915; The Young Churchman Company, Milwaukee, Wis.

THE ABOLITION OF WAR, Sherwood Eddy and Kirby Page; 1924; George H. Doran Company, New York.

CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM, William P. Merrill; 1919; The Macmillan Company, New York.

WAR ABOLITION, Harry P. Gibson; 1925; Robson and Adee, Schenectady, New York.

TOWARD THE UNDERSTANDING OF JESUS, Vladimir G. Simkhovitch; 1921; The Macmillan Company, New York.

CHURCH AND COLLEGE DENOUNCE PACIFIST PLEDGE; 1924; The National Civic Federation, New York.

CHAPTER II

WHAT THE CHURCHES OUGHT TO DO

It is assumed in this Syllabus that all Christians desire to have the menace of war removed and the entire war-system of the nations completely abolished. Essential to this end is the realization that the existing war-system of the nations is in principle a pagan institution, the method of savages and bullies for securing group ends, regardless of the rights and sufferings of others. To abolish war the nations must Christianize their relations, their conception of national rights and duties, and their procedures in maintaining even their unquestioned rights. They must definitely and determinedly set themselves to devise and establish the world institutions essential for world justice, for the peaceful settlement of all disputes and for cooperation in peace as a substitute for war and preparations for war. Permanent world peace can never be established on anything less than a reconstructed world-order based on the principles and ideals of the Kingdom of God.

The firm establishment of world peace as an effective system of international relations is, therefore, one of the essential objectives of the Christian Church. The questions to be considered in this chapter concern the concrete proposals and programs by which it is hoped to secure this end. More explicitly, what international policies should the Churches adopt, teach and advocate, looking toward a warless world?

I. Programs for Creating Goodwill

The creation and general adoption of a world-peace system in place of the existing war-system is, in the final analysis, a matter of developing in the minds and hearts of the nations a new spirit: a spirit of mutual consideration and respect, and a willingness to see the defects and wrong doings of one's own nation.

This part of the constructive program for world peace is in no sense political; it is distinctively a procedure in education and falls without question within the scope of the teaching duty of the Churches. This program has been appropriately called the "disarming of the mind". Positively it seeks to create goodwill and confidence between nations and races.

Questions

1. Do verbal professions of friendship between nations and governments have any value in producing mutual goodwill? If so, give reasons.

2. Were the return to China of the Boxer Indemnity and to Japan of the Shimonoseki Indemnity, and the gift of millions for famine, fire, flood and earthquake relief in Russia, Europe and the Orient of any positive result in international relations? Can you prove your belief by concrete illustrations?

3. What, if any, beneficial effects on international relations have been produced by foreign missions, aid to foreign educational institutions, fellowships and scholarships for foreign students, the exchange of professors, and friendly treatment of foreigners dwelling in our midst? Give specific instances.

4. What are the advantages of the "project method" of training in international goodwill over the usual methods of lectures, study classes and reading? Should or should not the Churches promote special studies in regard to those nations with whom our relations are more or less strained —Mexico, Russia, Japan? How can they do this most effectively?

5. What is your local church doing in these practical ways? Does it compare in energy and financial expenditures with what it does to meet its own wants—music, architecture, entertainments, etc?

6. What is your communion doing along these lines? What more can and should it do?

7. How far do international and inter-racial activities promote understanding and goodwill—e.g., world conferences, the Olympic games, the League of Nations, etc.? Should or should they not be fostered because of these by-products?

II. Programs for the World Cooperation of Churches

At the outbreak of the world war the churches of Christendom were severely condemned for their failure to prevent the war and also for such complete identification of religion and patriotism that the Christians in each land were virtually worshipping tribal gods.

Many have felt that the criticisms were justified and that the situation disclosed is intolerable. They have accordingly sought to bring the Churches of different lands into relation with one another, in the hope that such a world cooperation of Christians and of Churches might develop as would bridge the chasm between nations, secure mutual understanding and goodwill across national frontiers, and become a powerful agency for international justice, for national cooperation and for world peace.

It is urged that in times of international strain and irritation the Christians in each land will work for peace with more zeal if the Churches are in close contact and especially if they mutually know that fellow-Christians in other lands are also vigorously working for the same ends. Even in times of war, it is urged that Churches should have freedom for intercourse, under proper precautions, and that such freedom would have many beneficial results, in ameliorating the passions, in preventing hatreds and possibly in shortening the war.

Questions

1. Does the ideal suggested above have elements of value for our general program in working for a world-peace-system and for preventing war? Specify.

2. Would the nations be more likely to agree on world peace programs if the Churches within the various nations could agree on and work for the same concrete objectives? If not, why?

3. What steps, if any, have the Churches already taken in these directions?

4. What influences, if any, for world peace, have been exerted by such world gatherings as the Pan-Presbyterian, Pan-Methodist and Pan-Anglican World Assemblies? By the Edinburgh Missionary Conference? By the relations of Mission Churches in non-Christian lands to their respective supporting Churches in Christian lands?

5. What, if anything, has been accomplished for world peace by the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches? By the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work held at Stockholm?

6. Have significant contributions toward international understanding, goodwill and peace been made by such Christian organizations as the Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, the World's Sunday School Association, the Federations or Councils of Churches in various lands? Specify.

7. Do such international contacts and cooperation run the risk of weakening patriotism or of bringing harm to the countries involved? If so, how? Is there need of guarding against such possible dangers? How?

8. How may these international contacts and relations of Churches and Christian organizations be made more effective for the specific programs for world peace? Specify as concretely as possible.

III. Programs for the World Cooperation of States

We propose now to consider rapidly the various concrete plans for the cooperation of Governments, the universal adoption of which is believed by many to be essential to the overthrow of the war-system and war psychology of the nations and to the enthronement of justice and law, right, reason and goodwill in the life of the world. In connection with each of these plans we need to ask what the attitude of the Churches should be.

Throughout history preparations for war, threats of war, and acts of war have constituted the one final resort for nations in the settlement of their disputes. If war is really to be abolished it is evident that the nations must devise, and cooperate in creating and maintaining, a substitute method of settlement. Several proposals and achievements along this line are now before the world.

A. The League of Nations

The League of Nations consists of fifty-five governments which have agreed, in a remarkable Covenant, to abstain from war and to submit all their disputes to peaceful settlement by the use of various methods.

This League of Nations is the first instance in history of multitudes of nations entering into a league, the declared object of which is universal peace. Its activities cover a wide range, including the industrial, hygienic, social and moral welfare of all nations and races.

Except for Russia, Germany, Mexico and the United States, all the important nations of the world are members of the League.

The League is in process of development. It is dealing with world problems, determining world history, and developing international law at a rapid rate.

Questions

1. Is the League actually helping to solve difficulties between nations? Is it actually providing other methods than war for the settlement of disputes? Name some instances.

2. What effect, if any—good or bad—is the League having on the development of world consciousness, world standards, world conscience and world goodwill?

3. What responsible proposals are there, if any, for an Association of Nations as a substitute for the League? What are its prospects?

4. What are the causes, if any, of the relative weakness of the League of Nations in outlawing and preventing war?

5. What are the reasons given for and against the United States becoming a member of the League? Summarize these reasons? What are their respective merits?

6. Would American membership in the League strengthen it as a general agent for world peace?

7. Does the League rely on the sanctions of military force to secure its cohesion and to enforce its judgments? If not, what are the forces that are making it effective?

8. Should and could an effective and universal League of Nations rely exclusively on public opinion and mass goodwill, absolutely refusing the use of military force?

9. Has your church or communion taken any action dealing with the League or American membership therein?

10. Should the Churches of America express any opinion on the desirability of the United States joining the League?

11. If they should, should such an opinion be or not be qualified by specified reservations? If so, what should be the reservations?

12. Should the Churches of America express any judgment on the attitude thus far taken toward the League of Nations by the government of the United States? If so, what?

13. Should or should not the League of Nations be regarded as in some measure expressing the Christian ideal of the Kingdom of God? In either case, specify reasons.

B. The Permanent Court of International Justice

Through the activities of the League of Nations a plan for a World Court of Justice was drafted by the leading jurists of the world, one of whom was an American, and sent to the nations for their consideration.

Forty-eight nations have now by their separate and independent ratifications established the Court. It rests on their direct authority and not on that of the League.

Nearly one-half of the nations have accepted its compulsory jurisdiction in the four classes of difficulties that are recognized by international jurists as capable of judicial settlement.

The United States Senate voted (January 27, 1926), 76-17, to adhere to the World Court Protocol with five reservations and two resolutions. The reservations must be accepted by the forty-eight member nations of the Court before we shall actually join it.

Questions

1. Does the World Court of Justice help to provide a substitute for war? How and to what degree?

2. Will American membership strengthen the Court as an agent for settling international disputes? In what ways?

3. Were the limiting reservations and resolutions really necessary? Do they help or hinder the effectiveness of the Court?

4. Should the United States accept its compulsory jurisdiction in all justiciable matters? If she should do so only on certain conditions, what should these conditions be?

5. What merit is there in the contentions that the Hague Court of Arbitration is better than the Permanent Court of International Justice? That the World Court is merely the special attorney of the League of Nations? That the Permanent Court cannot be a World Court unless absolutely severed from the League?

6. Summarize reasons given for and against American membership in the World Court. What are their respective merits?

7. Did your communion take any official action regarding American membership in the World Court? If not, why?

C. The Codification of International Law

Experience shows that one important procedure in the establishment of peace is the adoption by the nations of regular principles and procedures in the conduct of their affairs.

A treaty between two nations, so long as it exists, constitutes a law by which to regulate their conduct. General treaties adopted by groups of nations constitute that much international law for them.

The treaty of Versailles constitutes a great body of new international law accepted by the fifty-five nations in the League. Very large sections of that Treaty were also mutually adopted by the United States and Germany.

The Covenant of the League of Nations forms a new basis for international law specifically designed to prevent war and to promote world peace.

During the past five years nearly nine hundred treaties between two or more Governments have been made and registered with the League of Nations; these constitute an enormous body of international law.

Various Commissions and Committees of the League are constantly drafting new codes and protocols, covering specific international interests. These become international law to the extent that they are ratified by the nations. The League of Nations has recently instituted a committee of international jurists to study the question of the further codification of international law by reducing to general terms those principles and procedures which are already embodied in treaties and practice. It plans thus to promote the clarity and authority of international law with respect to the matters treated.

Questions

1. To what degree is International Law codified and available for the use of the World Court? Does the Supreme Court of the United States ever apply International Law?

2. Should the United States refuse to consider a proposed general treaty merely because it has been drafted and sent to the United States by the League?

3. Does the United States register its treaties in the office of the League of Nations? If not, why?

4. Should the United States summon a convention of the nations to draft a code of international law? In either case, why?

5. What steps might the Churches take to promote the enactment, ratification and enforcement of international law?

6. Should or should not the Churches urge our Government to ratify the League's proposed "International Conventions" or treaties for the "Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children" and for "the Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Literature"?

D. Security and Disarmament

The maintenance of armaments by the nations is due, in the opinion of many, to suspicion and fear. Each believes itself to be insecure and liable to invasion, or at least in danger of having its rights violated and its interests ignored unless it is prepared to fight. Fear creates ever-growing armaments and growing armaments create increasing fear —a vicious circle. But colossal armaments also create serious economic difficulties in every land. They require vast expenditures on unproductive enterprises, to the loss of productive industry; they lower the standards of living and have disastrous effects on every national interest.

General disarmament, however, on any extensive scale, it is widely asserted, will be possible only when a general sense of security arises, and a sense of security will be possible only when nations learn to settle their disputes without resort to war or threat of war, and to stand together against a lawless nation.

Questions

1. Should or should not the United States cooperate with the other nations of the world in establishing a world-system for the peaceful settlement of every dispute?

2. Should or should it not include compulsory arbitration? Economic sanctions? Military sanctions? In each case, why? Why not?

3. Should or should not the United States unite with other nations in assuring security to the peace-loving and law-abiding nations? If it should, by what methods?

4. How can the United States best help all nations to unite in a program for universal disarmament?

5. Can the other nations establish a world-peace system without the United States? If so, how? If not, why?

6. In the absence of a world-peace system, how can world peace be assured? Specify plan.

7. What would be the probable effect of another world war? Could the United States keep out of it?

8. Do or do not the geographical position, the wealth, the strength and the moral advancement of the United States place upon her peculiar responsibility for leadership and even for sacrifice in these matters? Why?

9. What duty, if any, have the Churches in these matters?

E. The Outlawry of War

Two plans for abolishing war have been proposed.

1. **The Borah-Levinson Plan** proposes that all nations shall first adopt a resolution that all war is illegitimate and criminal (except in self-defense); that the nations which adopt such a resolution shall appoint representatives to a world conference to provide for the codification of international law; that, when this code has been adopted by the nations, a World Court shall be established, with compulsory jurisdiction; and that the only force behind this system and this World Court shall be public opinion.

2. **The Geneva Protocol Plan** was unanimously recommended by the official representatives of forty-eight Governments at the Assembly of the League of Nations on October 2, 1924. It proposes that all "aggressive war" be declared a crime; that, in case a war occurs, the proof as to which nation is the aggressor shall be the willingness or unwillingness of the nations concerned to submit the case for final settlement to the World Court of Justice or to some procedure of arbitration described in the Protocol; and that all the Covenant-keeping nations shall come to the defense of the nation attacked.

On the basis of these principles and procedures, elaborately stated, it was believed that the nations would soon develop a sense of security and a willingness to adopt general plans for disarmament.

Questions

1. Which of these two plans to outlaw war is the more practicable? Give reasons?

2. Should or should not the United States cooperate with other nations in establishing an effective system to outlaw war, to make compulsory the peaceful settlement of disputes and to bring to court a law-breaking, aggressor nation?

3. If the United States should help in these matters, should that help be limited to moral support? Or should it, if necessary, include economic pressure, and, in extreme cases, also military force?

4. Are the two plans mentioned above mutually exclusive? If they are more or less in agreement, point out their resemblances and their differences.

5. Should the Churches take interest in these matters as vital to the program for a warless world? Give reasons for and against.

6. Has your church expressed its mind on the Outlawry of War? If not, should or should it not do so?

IV. Programs for Eliminating the Causes of War

The causes of war are many and subtle. Practices by one nation or by the citizens of one nation in dealings abroad oftentimes quite unconsciously create ill-will, suspicion, indignation, fear, wrath—in a word, war-psychology. Many of the programs for abolishing war call attention to these "causes of war" and make concrete proposals for their removal. A single, brief Syllabus is wholly inadequate for dealing with all the varied social, economic and political factors that tend to produce war feelings. Some indication, however,

of their character and scope may well be given in this general survey of proposals for the abolition of war. They deal with such matters as the following:

1. Foreign markets and investments promoted and protected by the Flag

2. Monopolistic national control of raw materials essential to modern industry

3. Pressure of population on food supply and restriction of migration

4. A sensation-mongering, jingo press: a press directly and indirectly controlled by big munition or other financial interests

5. Protective and differential tariffs

6. Race discriminatory legislation

7. Oppressive treatment of political or religious minorities

8. Invasion of Oriental and primitive peoples by Occidental industrialism

9. "Unequal treaties", "Extra-territoriality" and "Concessions" in China.

In connection with each of these matters many programs have been suggested for rectifying the wrongs and promoting the right. Are these matters which the Churches should study and concerning which they should advocate definite policies and procedures? If so, how can they deal with them wisely and effectively? If not, what prospect is there of really abolishing war?

V. Matters Distinctively American

In addition to the general problems and programs suggested above, there is a group of questions distinctively American. What, for instance, should be the attitude of the Churches in regard to

1. The proposal to make Hawaii the most powerful naval base in the world, the "Gibraltar of the Pacific"

2. The proposal to build great naval bases at San Diego, San Francisco, and Puget Sound

3. The proposal of the Army to increase by 10,000 the number of trained soldiers regularly located in the Hawaiian Islands

4. The proposal of the General Staff of the Army to have an annual Muster Day for the entire manhood of the nation—otherwise named Mobilization or Defense Test Day. If the plan is wise, what day should be set aside for the purpose?

5. The virtual annexation of the little countries of the Caribbean under the ægis of the "Monroe Doctrine"

6. The activities of the Army and Navy in training the students of our colleges, universities and high schools by means of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the Citizens' Military Training Camps

7. The tendency in Army and Navy circles and in the so-called "patriotic" organizations to brand as disloyal all who do not actively support or those who even question their enlarging plans of military and naval preparedness

8. The proposal to remit in whole or in part the war debts of the allies to the United States.

Questions

1. Do these policies and proposals help or hinder the peace program of the World? Or do they have no relation to it?

2. How far, if at all, is it the duty of the Churches to follow, to scrutinize, and either to accept or to reject the policies of the General Staff of the Army and Navy?

3. Do or do not certain propaganda activities of the Army and the instruction given in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the Citizens' Military Training Camps tend to militarize the minds of our youth?

4. Should military training in "land grant colleges" be compulsory or optional? Are students who refuse to take such training to be upheld, or condemned as "unpatriotic"?

5. Do the Defense Test and Muster Day doings of the Army increase or decrease the war psychology of the nation? What effect do they have on the attitude of trust in or distrust of us, on the part of other nations?

6. Are the Churches and Christians under patriotic obligations to accept in obedient silence every plan proposed by high military and naval officials? If not, on what grounds and to what extent are they entitled to express their judgments?

7. Should Congress or the Departments of War and Navy be guided in their preparedness plans by officially expressed judgments of the Churches? If so, or if not, on what grounds?

8. Should or should not the Churches of America advocate the dismantling by joint agreements between the United States, Japan, Great Britain and other countries of all fortifications on the islands of the Pacific, in order to have —as on the United States, Canadian frontier—freedom from bristling fortifications?

9. Should or should not the Churches oppose actions of our Navy or of Congress tending to discredit and destroy the Four Power Pact for Peace in the Pacific?

10. Should the Churches of America express any judgment regarding the war debts of the Allies to the United States? If not, why? If so, what should it be?

VI. Miscellaneous Questions

1. Did the action of Congress in over-riding the recommendations of Secretary Hughes and President Coolidge regarding the Japanese exclusion question in May, 1924, help or hinder peace in the Pacific? Give reasons for your judgment.

2. Should or should not the indignation and resentment of Japanese, Chinese and East Indians, due to our race discriminatory legislation, which they regard as insulting and humiliating to them, cause us to modify our legislation?

3. Should or should not the Churches advocate the practical exclusion of Asiatic immigration? In either case, why? Can it be secured by laws free from racial discrimination? How?

4. Should the final decision in regard to declaring war be left to the people themselves by a national referendum? Is such a procedure practicable? If so, why? If not, why?

5. Should or should not the Churches adopt a policy in regard to chemical or disease-germ warfare? If so, what should it be?

6. Do or do not huge private corporations for the manufacture of military and naval munitions and supplies have a sinister influence on preparedness programs, on legislation, on international policies and on syndicated news? Should the Churches have a declared policy in regard to these matters?

7. Do or do not the colossal economic interests involved in the existing war-system of the nations play any part in maintaining this war-system? Specify reasons for and against.

8. What attitude, if any, should the Churches take in regard to the private manufacture of and foreign trade in war munitions?

9. What attitude, if any, should the Churches of America take toward the Youth Peace Movement of the World?

10. What duty, if any, have the Churches of America regarding China's demands for tariff autonomy and the abolition of "unequal treaties" and "extra-territoriality"?

11. Have the Churches of America any duty regarding the essential injustices of the Versailles Treaty, the alleged "sole guilt" of Germany for the war, and the "recognition" of Russia? Are there moral aspects of these issues on which the Churches should express their judgment. What are they?

12. Should the Churches of America urge Congress to enact a suitable law regarding the rights of the "Conscientious Objector", of whatever communion he may be a member?

13. In addition to the many definite problems and the programs for their solution mentioned in the foregoing pages, are there still others which the Churches should consider? If so, name them.

14. Among the many proposals for action looking toward a warless world, which are the most important? Are there some to which the Churches should give immediate attention? Which?

15. If the Churches are to take any real part in the stupendous program of outlawing and abolishing war, can they be satisfied with general resolutions embodying fine sentiments and abstract principles. If they should do more, how shall they proceed? How secure wise leaders? What specific courses of action should they adopt?

Suggestive Literature

THE CHRISTIAN CRUSADE FOR A WARLESS WORLD, Sidney L. Gulick; 1923; Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York.

WORLD MISSIONS AND WORLD PEACE, Caroline Atwater Mason; 1916; Central Committee, West Medford, Mass.

THE MAZE OF THE NATIONS AND THE WAY OUT, Gaius Glenn Atkins; 1915; Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.

LEAGUE OR WAR?, Irving Fisher; 1923; Harper and Brothers, New York.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS YEAR BOOK, 1925; World Peace Foundation, Boston, Mass.

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE, Irving Fisher; 1924; Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York.

THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES, William I. Hull; 1908; Ginn and Company, Boston, Mass.

THE A B C'S OF DISARMAMENT AND THE PACIFIC PROBLEMS, Arthur Bullard; 1921; The Macmillan Company, New York.

THE WORLD COURT, Antonio S. de Bustamente; 1925; The Macmillan Company, New York.

THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE AND THE QUESTION OF AMERICAN PARTICIPATION, Manley O. Hudson; 1925; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

WAYS TO PEACE, TWENTY PLANS SUBMITTED TO THE AMERICAN PEACE AWARD, Introduction by Esther Everett Lape, Preface by Edward W. Bok; 1924; Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

THE PREVENTION OF WAR, Philip Kerr and Lionel Curtis; 1923; Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn.

THE PROBLEM OF INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS, D. Mitrany; 1925; Oxford University Press, England.

CROSS CURRENTS IN EUROPE TODAY, Charles A. Beard; 1922; Marshall Jones Company, Boston, Mass.

EUROPE TURNS THE CORNER, Stanley High; 1925; The Abingdon Press, New York.

THE RECENT FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES, George H. Blakeslee; 1925; The Abingdon Press, New York.

THE REAWAKENING OF THE ORIENT, Lectures by Sir Valentine Chirol, Yusuke Tsurumi and Sir James Arthur Salter; 1925; Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn.

ORIENTAL INTERPRETATIONS OF THE FAR EASTERN PROBLEM, Lectures by Count Michimasa Soyeshima and President P. W. Kuo; 1925; Chicago University Press, Chicago, Ill.

SYLLABUS ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (A full compendium of books and magazine articles on International Questions), by Parker Thomas Moon; 1925; The Macmillan Company, New York.

CHAPTER III

CHURCH PROGRAMS OF EDUCATION FOR WORLD PEACE

It is important that each Church should know what is actually being done to educate its membership and especially the young people in its Sunday Schools, academies and colleges to understand world problems and to work constructively for world peace.

The local church groups in each communion should, therefore, familiarize themselves with the facts and also consider carefully what more the Churches, both national and local, should do.

1. Does your communion have an officially established committee, commission or department to which is assigned the specific duty of promoting an educational program on peace among your churches, Sunday Schools and other church institutions? If so, when was the action taken, who are those responsible, how often do they meet, and, in brief, what have they done?

2. Does your communion provide a budget for this peace educational program? How much? Is it enough really to do what needs to be done?

3. What steps, if any, have been taken in your communion to find out the attitudes of children and youth which may be regarded as favorable or unfavorable toward securing world peace?

4. What programs of training are in operation to counteract undesirable attitudes and to create those that are desirable?

5. Do you know what proportion of your pastors and churches observed Armistice Sunday (November 8, 1925), as suggested by the Federal Council of Churches?

6. Has the religious press of your communion made any special efforts to inform its constituency on the world problems of war and peace and on the responsibilities of Christians and Churches to support our Government in its efforts to adopt Christian policies in international relations? Specify instances.

7. Did the local congregations of your communion taken any action during the past year or two regarding adhesion by the United States to the Permanent Court of International Justice? If so, approximately how many? Has your religious press taken interest in this question or commended it to its readers? Name the editors.

8. Are there any books on world peace questions which have had special popularity in your communion? Give titles and authors.

9. Of the various available courses on peace for study groups do you know from experience of actual use which have proved most acceptable? Name them.

10. Has your communion adopted the "International Ideals of the Churches" as suggested by the Federal Council of Churches? If not, was this due to some opposition to its declarations of faith and purpose? Or to some other reason?

11. Has your church adopted the "Five Point Program"? Can it really do what it should without some such method?

12. In case replies to the above questions are chiefly negative, must we conclude that the pastors and church members of your communion are indifferent to the problems of war and peace? Or is there some other explanation?

Suggestive Literature

THE MESSAGE TO THE CHURCHES OF THE UNITED STATES—NATIONAL STUDY CONFERENCE ON THE CHURCHES AND WORLD PEACE; 1925; Continuation Committee, 105 East 22nd Street, New York.

WHAT PASTORS AND CHURCHES CAN DO IN THE CRUSADE FOR A WARLESS WORLD; 1924; Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York.

A FIVE POINT PROGRAM FOR CHURCHES—WORKING FOR A WARLESS WORLD; Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York.

MOBILIZING FOR PEACE, Edited by Frederick Lynch; 1924; Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.

BOOKS OF GOODWILL: VOL. I. THROUGH THE GATEWAY (A collection of Stories, Poems, Pageants, Games, Projects and Prayers); 1925; National Council for Prevention of War, Washington, D. C.

BRAVE ADVENTURES (Stories for Children), Katharine S. Cronk; 1925; Central Committee, West Medford, Mass.

WORLD FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCH SCHOOL, John Leslie Lobingier; 1923; University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

PROJECTS IN WORLD FRIENDSHIP, John Leslie Lobingier; 1925; University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

"ON EARTH PEACE", Edited by Rhoda McCulloch and Margaret Burton; 1925; Federation of Women's Foreign Mission Boards and the Council of Women for Home Missions, New York.

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP AMONG THE NATIONS, Jerome Davis and Roy B. Chamberlain; 1925; Pilgrim Press, Boston, Mass.

CHRISTIAN YOUNG PEOPLE AND WORLD-FRIENDSHIP, Erwin L. Shaver; 1925; University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.